

REMARKS

This Amendment and Reply is intended to be completely responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed February 16, 2011. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the reasons that follow. No amendments, cancellations or additions have been made to the claims. Accordingly, Claims 18-37 will remain pending in the present Application upon entry of this Amendment and Reply.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 3-4 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 18 and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication No. 2001-191361 to Mizuno (“Mizuno”). This rejection should be withdrawn because Mizuno fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

For example, independent Claim 18 recites a “method of making a vehicle component” comprising, among other elements, “positioning a formed skin in the first cavity proximate the first mold section so that a first edge of the formed skin extends outward past the first projection toward the second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member . . . moving the first shut-off from the first position to the second position to provide a second cavity defined by a second portion of the first mold section, a second portion of the second mold section, the first edge of the formed skin that is extended past the first projection, the first resin, and the first shut-off member when in the second position, injecting a second resin into the second cavity while the first edge of the formed skin remains extended past the first projection and bonding the second resin to the first resin and the first edge of the formed skin” (emphasis added).

Mizuno does not disclose, teach or suggest such a method. In rejecting independent Claim 18, the Examiner relied on Figure 7 and alleged that Mizuno teaches “positioning a

formed skin having a first edge . . . in the first cavity proximate the first mold section so that the first edge of the formed skin extends outward past the first projection toward the second section such that a free end faces the shut-off member.” Applicants respectfully disagree. Figure 6(b) is a partial detailed view of Figure 7. From Figure 6(b), it is clear that a free end of the “epidermis 8,” shown as an “edge 8a,” does not extend outward past the “projected rim 13” toward the “second assembled die 20” such that the free end faces the “slide core 31.” In contrast, the “epidermis 8” is shown as wrapping around the “projected rim 13” such that the “edge 8a” faces a direction that is substantially perpendicular to the “slide core 31” rather than in a direction that faces the “slide core 31.” In fact, Mizuno appears to teach away from anything short of having the “epidermis 8” wrap around the “projected rim 13” when it discusses using the “slide core 31” to press the “epidermis 8” against the “projected rim 13” (see, e.g., paragraph [0025]). If the “edge 8a” extended outward past the “projected rim 13” toward the “second assembled die 20” such that the free end faced the “slide core 31,” rather than wrapping around the “projected rim 13,” the “epidermis 8” would not get pressed against the “projected rim 13” by the “slide core 31” as taught by Mizuno. As such, Mizuno does not disclose, teach or suggest positioning a formed skin in a first cavity proximate a first mold section so that a first edge of the formed skin extends outward past a first projection toward a second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member, as recited by independent Claim 18.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 because at least one element of such claim is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Mizuno. Claims 24-27, as they depend from independent Claim 18, are allowable therewith for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 18 and 24-27 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 5-6 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 19, 20, 22 and 28-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuno in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002017360 to Hiraiwa et al. (“Hiraiwa et al.”). On pages 7-9 of the Detailed Action, the

Examiner rejected Claims 21 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuno and Hiraiwa et al. in further view of Japanese Publication No. 2002-187166 to Ae (“Ae et al.”). On pages 9-10 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuno and Hiraiwa et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,248,200 to Dailey et al. (“Dailey et al.”). These rejections should be withdrawn because Mizuno, alone or in any proper combination with Hiraiwa et al., Ae et al. and/or Dailey et al., does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed inventions.

Similar to independent Claim 18, independent Claims 28 and 35 also recite a “method of making a vehicle component” comprising, among other elements, “positioning the formed skin in the first cavity proximate the first mold section between the first projection and the second projection so that the first edge of the formed skin extends outward past the first projection toward the second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member.”

As set forth above, Mizuno does not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of positioning a formed skin in a first cavity proximate a first mold section so that a first edge of the formed skin extends outward past a first projection toward a second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member during a multiple resin injection process. Neither Hiraiwa et al., Ae et al. nor Dailey et al. correct this deficiency of Mizuno as a prior art reference. In contrast, as detailed in Applicants’ previous response, Hiraiwa et al. teaches a one-step molding process that utilizes the filling pressure of melted resin to retract the thrust rod 35 (page 4, paragraph [0041]) and it’s teachings are not applicable to a process that utilizes the injection of a second resin. Further, Applicants note that Ae et al. was only being relied upon for allegedly disclosing the addition of a third part to a two-part trim molding, while Dailey et al. was only being relied upon for allegedly disclosing a flexible sheet material.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 28 and 35 because at least one element of such claims is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Mizuno, alone or in any proper combination with Hiraiwa et al., Ae et al. and/or Dailey et al.

Applicants submit that Claims 19-23, as they depend from Claim 18, Claims 29-34, as they depend from Claim 28, and Claims 36 and 37, as they depend from Claim 35, are allowable therewith at least because of their dependency, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 19-23 and 28-37 is respectfully requested.

* * *

Applicants believe that the present Application is now in condition for allowance. In particular, even when the elements of Applicants' claims, as discussed above, are given a broad construction and interpreted to cover equivalents, the cited references do not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Favorable reconsideration of the present Application as amended is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants respectfully put the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8/15/2011

By /Adam M. Gustafson/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (414) 297-5652
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Adam M. Gustafson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,601